

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated March 25, 2008, it is noted that claims 1, 3-7, 11, 12, and 18-29 are pending and that claims 1, 3-7, 11, 12, and 18-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

By this response, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations from claim 4 and claims 4 and 21-29 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 12, 18-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 12, 18-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,408,435 to Sato (hereinafter “Sato”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,410,326 to Goldstein (hereinafter “Goldstein”). Claims 4 and 21-29 have been cancelled. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims. Claims 3, 5-7 and 18 depend directly from claim 1 and claims 12 and 19-20 depend directly from claim 11. Claim 11 includes limitations substantially similar to those included in claim 1. The remarks below will be directed to claim 1 and will be understood to pertain equally to claim 11 as well.

The Sato and Goldstein references have been addressed in the responses to prior Office Actions. As a result, the prior remarks related to those references will not be repeated herein and are incorporated herein in their entirety for the sake of brevity in this response.

In rejecting the limitations in claim 4, now included in amended claim 1, the present Office Action cites Sato at col. 7, lines 7-13. That passage from Sato is reproduced below as follows:

Registration of electronic devices may be done through the personal computer 21, for example. Registration may be made either upon installment of the audio/visual system or each time when a user sets his audio/visual devices in desired modes of operation, referring to on WWW pages. Also, the registration may be done on the part of the interface box 25.

Nowhere in the cited passage from Sato is there any teaching, showing, or suggestion related to determining a code for graphically representing a controllable feature of the appliance on the GUI of the control device includes extracting a device control profile depending on at least one of: a location parameter, a time parameter, and a user profile, as defined in amended claim 1. In the cited passage, Sato appears to require the user's physical interaction through the computer to register the electronic devices. But there is no suggestion that the registration, in

any way, involves the extraction of a device control profile or that the extraction of the device control profile is performed in dependence on at least one of: a location parameter, a time parameter, and a user profile, as defined in amended claim 1. From a careful review of Goldstein, it appears that Goldstein is also silent with respect to these limitations. Therefore, it is submitted that Sato and Goldstein fail to teach, show, or suggest all the elements of claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon. Since claim 11 includes limitations similar to those discussed above for claim 1, it is also submitted that Sato and Goldstein fail to teach, show, or suggest all the elements of claim 11 and the claims dependent thereon.

In rejecting the limitations in claim 6, the present Office Action cites Sato at col. 6, lines 40-66. That passage from Sato is repeated below as follows:

FIG. 8 shows a construction of the interface box 25. As shown in FIG. 8, the interface box 25 has a code storage portion 52. As shown in FIG. 9, the code storage portion 52 stores code data (information on codes and carriers) of infrared signals for difference devices of different manufacturers. That is, codes and carriers used for controlling electronic devices with infrared signals are different among manufacturers. Even for devices from the same manufacturer, codes and carriers are often different among types of devices and those having different fabrication dates. The code storage portion 52 stores all code data of all devices of different manufacturers as shown in FIG. 9.

In FIG. 8, a command prepared on a WWW page for setting electronic devices in desired modes of operation is sent from the personal computer 21 to the interface box 25. The command is applied to a controller 51 via an interface 53. The controller 51 interprets the command, and a corresponding code data is read out from the code storage portion 52. Output from the code storage portion 52 is supplied to an infrared signal generator 54 which, in turn, generates an infrared signal of the code and carrier determined by the code data.

As referred to above, codes and carriers for controlling electronic devices are different among different manufacturers and even among different devices from the same manufacturer depending on types and dates of fabrication. On the other hand, commands sent to the interface box 25 determine respective modes of operation of devices commonly to all devices regardless of manufacturers or types.

Nowhere in the cited paragraphs from Sato is there any teaching, showing, or suggestion that editing of the code is enabled, as defined in claim 6. In the cited passage, Sato appears to suggest code data storage of the code data received from WWW pages of the manufacturer. But there is not even a remote suggestion that the code received from the device manufacturer over the WWW pages can be edited by the recipient. From a careful review of Goldstein, it appears that Goldstein is also silent with respect to the limitation of enabling editing of the code.

Enablement of code editing is taught only in the present application. Therefore, it is submitted that Sato and Goldstein fail to teach, show, or suggest all the elements of claim 6.

In light of these remarks, it is believed that claims 1 and 11 and the claims dependent thereon would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art upon a reading of Sato and Goldstein, either separately or in combination. Therefore, it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 11 and their respective dependent claims 3, 5-7, 12, 18-20 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment, reconsideration, and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian S. Myers
Registration No.: 46,947
For: Michael Marion
Registration No.: 32,266

Mail all correspondence to:

Michael Marion
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001